CRDSP Meeting Minutes

Attending to the Past while Meeting the Challenges of the Future

In Conjunction with GeoSpatial'09
Snowbird Conference Center
Snowbird, UT
April 28-May 1, 2008

CRDSP Meeting Minutes
E. Ingbar

8:30 Tuesday

Kirk Halford
Ari Leeflang
Chris Cook
Karyn deDufour
Jason Strahl
Damon Murdo
Monica Weimer
Mary Sullivan
Scott Goodman
Rick Karl
Joan Dale
Bill Hedman
David Sisson
Chris Arthur
Kristen Jensen
Dan Martin
Barb Kett BLM Data Mgmnt Group (NOC)

Housekeeping

Listed possible papers of interest at Geospatial Meeting

Agenda Review

Special Recognition
	Special Achievement in GIS (ESRI SAG) 2008

Communication, Training, and Support

Nevada – good collaboration between SHPO and BLM. Perhaps not as much
communication between BLM Rep and field offices. Issues coordinating Deputy FPO

and Data Rep time for contact with field offices. Also, with Chris moved to supervisory position he has a lot less time to lead field offices.

Utah – Doing okay, at fledgling level. Relationship is building. Typically meet every 4 to 6 weeks.

Time is a key barrier to field office staff spending time on data sharing. The BLM staff in the group requested that a letter get generated through the management chain, via the State Director.

David S. – in Idaho, we are putting this in the annual work plan (AWP). The precursor to the AWP is the planned target allocation (PTA). Getting the data representative work in to PTA then AWP would be most helpful.

We will put this on the Preservation Board agenda.

Colorado – good communication between Data Rep and SHPO, but the field offices are not in the loop.

Arizona – things are working well!

Chris C. – we are creeping along because we are working through the state leadership team to put in place the enforced pipeline of communication and data use. On the SHPO side, the plan is to arrive at the "clean" data point about the time that the administrative structure or mandates are in place.

Training – business process – the tools are so complicated (or users so reluctant) that there is resistance. Even at the best, folks estimate maybe 20% won't use these systems at all.

Barbara Kett – DOI has established a GIO position. OMB circulars, including A-16, are being revised and things are changing a lot at the higher levels. There is a huge current emphasis on spatial data that will trickle down. Some states are making major changes now – Nevada is one – in which the use of spatial data, workflow, etc., are all part of a process of change.

Within BLM, there is an Enterprise Geographic Information team who are implementing the Enterprise Geographic Information System (EGIS).

Scott – leery of top-down meeting bottom-up initiatives (e.g., the Chunnel).

Barb – involve yourselves now in these big initiatives so things happen appropriately. (Barb is the BLM data architect; she has a counterpart in BLM who is the geospatial data architect.) CRDSP has the opportunity to influence the data standards discussion. Kirk should seek information from Bob Bewley who is leading the effort.

So there is a need for training at the national / standards / enterprise level. This is informational training.

Everyone agreed that BLM staff time is too scarce. In each state a data representative could be full-time attending to field office assistance and needs.

There is also a need for training at the manager level. The SMT-level managers are important and getting on the SMT agenda in each state is important.

There may be a need to train the GIS staff at the FO level to understand cultural resource GIS data (data model and confidentiality).

The relationship between IT and GIS is important to understand.

SHPO Breakout Group

Key issues:
- SHPOs do not manage internal BLM communications and are reluctant to do so.
- SHPOs work in a larger administrative arena than just BLM.
- BLM can provide leadership to other agencies and bring those agencies in to data sharing partnerships
    o The FGDC effort is a good place to start this effort
- We should create new break out sessions for SHPOs. Four calls or contacts per year. These will just continue after the existing quarterly calls.
- NCSHPO does not represent the data management side of SHPO well at all. So, relying upon NCSHPO to speak (at least for western SHPO) data needs is fruitless.
- Final reports from BLM – SHPOs don't always get a final version. Some standardization of documentation distribution is important. There is a disconnect between the compliance process and the "this is the REAL final version problem". For example, the consultant sends in a report which lists Site X as eligible under "B and C", but the next version of the report has the site as "not eligible". Recommendation: clarify the work flow in each state, so that the BLM is providing FINAL reports in to the archive.
- Some states assign site numbers based on proactive assignment (requesting some information up front). Some states would rather correct on the back end of the process for sign up.
- Among the states present (Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, Utah) all except Nevada give out state-based numbers to BLM and insist that they be used. The SHPO group STRONGLY RECOMMENDS that BLM will use state-assigned numbers as early as possible for sites and other cultural resources.
- Among the states present, Arizona and Utah hand out project numbers in advance.
- Training needs: Data sharing models (replication, hand to hand, pushed out, on-line, etc.). This would be useful for data managers to know. Which ones have worked? For instance, we could create a compendium of models of ways one

COULD share data, but which ones has BLM already tried? Which worked? And, which will work in the future?

- Can we come up with a recommendation about a minimum training standard for BLM staff?
    - o Roles, responsibilities of BLM and SHPO
- Or, instead, can we come up with a goal that all data will come to SHPO from BLM in digital form by some date from now (3 years?).
    - o This may drive a requirement for BLM training, permitting
    - o PDFs of report, resource records
    - o Geospatial data
- What is the TDAR? Should SHPOs push their way in? Can we engage them early on, before they find a director? At the moment, they seem to ignore the SHPOs per se. We need to engage them on the official basis – need to get a SHPO representative on their board or at least in their sphere of advisors. The justifications for this are ample, but one of them that is easy to point to is NADB, which failed pretty miserably. Propose a partnership.
- Get Keith Kintigh to do a presentation to the CRDSP

BLM Breakout Group

Communication

State Issues – Disconnect between management / SMT
- ■ State Lead communicate to State Director on behalf of CRDSP
- ■ Presentation to SMT – each state should schedule one
- ■ Presentation to Multi-Resource Staff (at state level)
- ■ Communicate with IT and GIS at State Office
    - o Select a GIS person to join the team in each state. They will serve as the in-state advocate and source of information for CITRIX, data standards, training, etc.). Permission / encouragement to do so needs to come from WO

Washington Office level
- ■ Educate WO IT and GIS staff about the partnership
- ■ Monthly national call on GIS – add a participant to this call
- ■ Need WO understanding and support for data representatives (IM?)
- ■ Funding issues being directed to CRDSP
- ■ Education and clarification of protocol and its role (IM?)

SHPO
- ■ Semi-annual Meetings (CRDSP meeting, in-state meeting)
- ■ Reality Check on Goals

Training
- ■ Targeted GIS training specific to archaeological applications
- ■ Kirk will put California tool bar manual up on web (already at ftp://ftp.gnomon.com/BLMCa)

- One on one, just in time training is most effective
- Collection of data / GPS standards
  - Specific course (contractor?)
- Hiring and PDs should include GIS skills
  - Check for questions on quick-hire as screening questions

Support – Partnering with GIS will provide this (partnering at multiple levels)

Training and Support Needs By State

Alaska

SHPO – Help SHPO staff by providing a manager's overview on GIS and GPS, the CRDSP, and how development can proceed. This will help them to understand how OAHP needs to assist the BLM through decision-making.
Dovetail the above with geodatabase training.

Arizona

ArcGIS desktop
Sign on to in-house database (map services)
Display and query data as appropriate
Rick will work with Mike Johnson (AZSO; or new data representative) to create a training plan

California

Re-emphasize geodatabase use by BLM staff (currently focusing on GPS use)
Build in to manager's protocol training more discussion on CRDSP

Colorado

Build in to manager's protocol training more discussion on CRDSP
Teach / inform managers how data sharing is supposed to work at the Field Office ← → SHPO level
Train contributors on GIS standard for sending data to SHPO, so that SHPO staff do not need to spend so much time manipulating GIS datasets sent to SHPO.
Training for BLM staff will occur at the annual BLM cultural meeting.
No current plan for training permittees, but will continue to think on it (e.g., could hook on to CCPA meeting)

Idaho

Pushing out geodatabase, so need to create a manual
Will work the plan to promulgate use of the geodatabase tool for day to day work (one on one training, support, and then broader introduction)
Tailored GPS training would be excellent

Montana

Once database is up and running, training the field offices on it.
Since almost all the archaeologists are GIS-savvy, there won't need to be a lot of training.
Possible CITRIX training

Nevada
Basic GIS / ArcMap
How to understand your role in the CRDSP
One of the problems is that there is no state 1050 meeting. Management barriers are hampering the ability of the data representative to train field offices
A key need, then, is support for CRDSP activities

New Mexico (no update)

Oregon
Waiting for buy-in on business plan, but once in place:
Training on work flow
Data collection processes and standards
Scott would do training on OHIMS, need another trainer for GPS
Archaeologist-specific geodatabase and tools training (probably at annual meeting)

Utah
Information / Education on how data sharing is structured in Utah (roles and responsibilities)
Training on direct SDE connection (documentation already exists) for those who wish to continue using ArcMap
Continued training (or re-education) on submittal requirements (site records, encoding forms)
Attend annual protocol meetings to update BLM staff on data sharing in Utah, collect comments, problems, (applause), etc.

Wyoming
Refresher training – many new staff in places like Rawlins, Buffalo; also many new contractors
SHPO staff also need training, especially on protocol requirements
Continued training / work with field offices on how to populate the field-entry geodatabase

Many States
Permittees need a better understanding of what is required of them

4/29/2009

Attendees
As yesterday, with Deidre McCarthy and Peter Ainsworth attending also

Brief review from yesterday – no new thoughts expressed

Kirk – Budget Update
Kirk passed out the Washington Office briefing paper. This paper demonstrates that the CRDSP is saving BLM hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Kirk has made the point that this funding is perennial, and has no sunset.

Kirk is seeking an additional $5k per state for 10 states (California is not included).

Kirk also procured an additional $10k that is available to states by grant applications. The proposals should focus on metadata, implementation, or training. This may be awarded as two $5k grants or a single $10k grant.

The AWP has not yet been issued, so funds have not yet descended to the states from CRDSP. The AWP is expected to appear this week.

Economic stimulus money has been allocated for "shovel-ready" projects. In California, many of the projects are abandoned mine lands (AML). Colorado and Nevada are also receiving a fair amount of money for AML projects.

Susan Hixson – INFRA update
Donna Day and Mike _____ are now the INFRA managers. Susan says that the data-sharing with SHPOs is now on hold, because INFRA is part of the NRM (National Resource Manager) system. High priority items for INFRA are audit and year-end closing for this year, with other priority items pushed to next year.

Rick Karl - Arizona discussed pulling USFS data to pull in to AZSITE, but this was a discussion with Jeff Overturf and Dave Johnson. It never went to fruition.

Susan's question to state folks – do you all need different things or is there a common standard set of attributes?

Benchmarking in INFRA is different from INFRA to GIS integration.

BASE tickets – requests for INFRA additions and programming. Business requirements are key to this since nothing happens without them. We need to contact Donna Day about this.

Kirk – shared need between CRDSP and INFRA – create a task group in CRDSP that defines the common data fields needed.

Kristen and Ari – Utah SHPO ArcGIS Server System
Demo of current system (planned for replacement in summer of 2009).

Discussion followed on access, costs, project development. Also, several states said that their experience is that folks use the on-line (web) system far more than bringing the map service in to ArcMap.

Deidre McCarthy – FGDC Standards Issue

CRDSP Metadata Implementation
Karyn: SHPOs do not enforce metadata or data standards. The site record reviewer (i.e., BLM) is responsible for the metadata being populated appropriately. All the SHPO can do is design their systems to contain the feature-level metadata and dataset metadata. Enforcement is up to the agency that accepts the data in the first place, because the SHPO data managers cannot kick back electronic data for lack of metadata.

There was general agreement that the SHPO data managers do not want to be the "experts" on metadata. They want the "boundary" to lie more with BLM in terms of enforcement, user education, requirements. Data manager's job is to provide the place to put it.

This highlights a need to create educational and information materials on the metadata standards – for consultants, for field staff, and even for SHPO compliance staff.

Permit Standards and Stipulations
The foregoing discussion makes clear that there is a real risk that BLM or the SHPOs could be put in a situation where they have to manipulate data after the fact of fieldwork. Kirk pointed out that the permit stipulations that reference the GPS IM of several years ago resolve this problem.

General resolution: permit stipulations are needed in every state. This will have to go through the Preservation Board.

Access Issues
Kirk discussed the Vulcan Powerline project. The cultural resource firm that gathered the background information was prepared to give the powerline proponent a full set of maps with all sites shown, etc. This raised a red flag for the cultural resource firm and (especially) for Kirk.

In Wisconsin, all data is distributed under license. The license is for a limited use, project-specific, cut of data that the cultural resource firm holds for a limited time.

Everyone seems to be struggling with this issue in some way. For example, a proponent might be shown site presence in 1000 meter segments along a linear project (yes/no there is a site present).

Chris said that in Wyoming, the problem is on the other side too. The cultural resource firms are becoming very diligent about redacting site location information from reports. The firms then also provide the BLM with a confidential appendix containing the site data.

There was general agreement that access issues are important. There seem to be two approaches: inform the proponents via permit stipulations on consultants; license data cuts. Even a Class I should require notification of BLM (e.g., a fieldwork authorization). Redaction of reports might be another avenue (changes in the 8100 manual might be needed here). UDOT has wording on redaction (check their web site, put in minutes?).

State of States – 1 Year Progress Toward Goals
Alaska – there really has been progress on goals. There is a dialog started between Alaska SHPO and BLM. However, the SHPO is not yet on board with the notion of dealing with archive as opposed to dealing with all of the internal SHPO information. Security is an open question for AHRS data, viz. distribution to folks who are not cultural resource professionals? BLM has a concern about data being given out. The security of data needs to be discussed with the SHPO, as does the "energizing" the archive functions of SHPO. On the positive side, the implementation of the toolbar will allow BLM to send SHPO data much more easily.

California – Some progress on goals. Eric I. asked Rick Karl about how AZSITE managed to create an effective coalition of multiple agencies and interests. AZSITE has a product, keeps it in front of partners and users, and makes small changes frequently to show progress to everyone. This might be a model for California – perception of progress. Kristen pointed out a lack of information leads to folks assuming the worst outcome, not the best.

The group turned to general discussion instead of state by state reviews.

Joan asked Rick about AZSITE doing periodic closures to get caught up. Rick said that he started this and it seems to be fine with AZSITE users.

Joan also asked about data clean up – what is "clean enough"? Every state has the issue of what is perfect information, and whether perfect is the enemy of the good. Kristen pointed out that more eyes looking at data will find your errors (Rick concurred). So, having a process for error reporting and repair is important.

Karyn pointed out that afunctional partnerships need to be examined from the viewpoint of lost revenue or additional cost due to poor partnerships. For example, Kristen's estimate of $1200 per file search (to conduct it in the office) suggests that every project that *cannot* use an automated file search costs about $1000 in (proponent-borne) search costs. Karyn suggested creating a table like this:

	BLM Dollars Raised by SHPO	Non-BLM file search	Dollars Dedicated to SHPO
AK	$30k		$0 (no file search)

AZ $30k $150k

… and so forth

Everyone discussed how to form a better system for Alaska. Don't reinvent the wheel – use what is already out there, what works. Alaska needs to see what else is in the world and hook in to it. Separate out the critical functions for BLM – SHPO interaction from the internal SHPO needs.

Annual reporting is an important part of accountability – and accountability is another tool for helping to reinforce appropriate partnership opportunities.

Next Conference Call (which will have SHPO follow-on session)
Next conference call proposed for just before Preservation Board Meeting (week of Memorial Day?) (Thursday 5/28 9 a.m. PDT)

Possible next meeting
Possible next meeting – earlier in the year (March, February). Asilomar? Folsom Lake location?

Karyn: Start meeting on Monday and allot half of Tuesday too. Especially important in conjunction with Geospatial meeting. Bill thinks we do need two full days. One idea is to meet for a day, and then do presentations that are public, then do a continuation of meeting.